On the dynamical Rayleigh-Taylor instability in compressible viscous flows without heat conductivity

Fei Jiang[a,b,*], Song Jiang[b]

[a] *College of Mathematics and Computer Science, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, 350108, China.*
[b] *Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, Beijing, 100088, China.*

arXiv:1403.5016v1 [math.AP] 20 Mar 2014

Abstract

We investigate the instability of a smooth Rayleigh-Taylor steady-state solution to compressible viscous flows without heat conductivity in the presence of a uniform gravitational field in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. We show that the steady-state is linearly unstable by constructing a suitable energy functional and exploiting arguments of the modified variational method. Then, based on the constructed linearly unstable solutions and a local well-posedness result of classical solutions to the original nonlinear problem, we further reconstruct the initial data of linearly unstable solutions to be the one of the original nonlinear problem and establish an appropriate energy estimate of Gronwall-type. With the help of the established energy estimate, we show that the steady-state is nonlinearly unstable in the sense of Hadamard by a careful bootstrap argument. As a byproduct of our analysis, we find that the compressibility has no stabilizing effect in the linearized problem for compressible viscous flows without heat conductivity.

Keywords: Compressible Navier-Stokes equations, steady solutions, Rayleigh-Taylor instability, instability in the Hadamard sense.
2000 MSC: 35Q35, 76D03.

1. Introduction

The motion of a three-dimensional (3D) compressible viscous fluid without heat conductivity in the presence of a uniform gravitational field in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary is governed by the following Navier-Stokes equations:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \mathrm{div}(\rho v) = 0, \\ \rho v_t + \rho v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla p = \mu \Delta v + \mu_0 \nabla \mathrm{div} v - \rho g e_3, \\ \rho e_t + \rho v \cdot \nabla e + p \mathrm{div} v = \mu |\nabla v + \nabla v^{\mathrm{T}}|^2/2 + \lambda (\mathrm{div} v)^2. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here the unknowns $\rho := \rho(t,x)$, $v := v(t,x)$, $e := e(t,x)$ and $p = a\rho e$ denote the density, velocity, specific internal energy and pressure of the fluid respectively, $\mu_0 = \mu + \lambda$ and $a = \gamma - 1$. The known constants λ, μ and γ are the viscosity coefficients and the ratio of specific heats satisfying the natural restrictions:

$$\mu > 0, \quad 3\lambda + 2\mu \geq 0; \quad \gamma > 1.$$

*Corresponding author: Tel +86-18305950592.
Email addresses: jiangfei0591@163.com (Fei Jiang), jiang@iapcm.ac.cn (Song Jiang)

$g > 0$ is the gravitational constant, $e_3 = (0, 0, 1)^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the vertical unit vector, and $-ge_3$ is the gravitational force.

In this paper we consider the problem of the Rayleigh-Taylor (RT) instability for the system (1.1). Thus, we choose a RT (steady-state) density profile $\bar{\rho} := \bar{\rho}(x_3)$ which is independent of (x_1, x_2) and satisfies

$$\bar{\rho} \in C^4(\bar{\Omega}), \quad \inf_{x\in\Omega} \bar{\rho} > 0, \quad \bar{\rho}'(x_3^0) > 0 \ \text{ for some } x_3^0 \in \{x_3 \mid (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \Omega\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\bar{\rho}' := \mathrm{d}\bar{\rho}/\mathrm{d}x_3$. We remark that the first condition in (1.2) guarantees that the steady density profile belongs to some $C^0([0, T), H^3(\Omega))$, the second one in (1.2) prevents us from treating vacuum in the construction of unstable solutions, while the third one in (1.2) assures that there is at least a region in which the RT density profile has larger density with increasing x_3 (height), thus leading to the classical RT instability as will be shown in Theorem 1.1 below. By the theory of first-order linear ODE, for given $\bar{\rho}$ in (1.2) we can find a corresponding steady internal energy $\bar{e}$ that only depends on x_3 and is unique up to a constant divided by $\bar{\rho}$, i.e.,

$$\bar{e} = -g(a\bar{\rho})^{-1} \int \bar{\rho}(x_3)\mathrm{d}x_3,$$

such that

$$0 < \bar{e} \in C^4(\bar{\Omega}) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla\bar{p} = -\bar{\rho}ge_3 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\bar{p} := a\bar{\rho}\bar{e}$. Clearly, the RT density profile $(\bar{\rho}, v \equiv 0, \bar{e})$ gives a steady state to the system (1.1).

Now, we define the perturbation of (ρ, v, e) by

$$\varrho = \rho - \bar{\rho}, \quad u = v - 0, \quad \theta = e - \bar{e}.$$

Then, the triple (ϱ, u, θ) satisfies the perturbed equations

$$\begin{cases} \varrho_t + \mathrm{div}((\varrho + \bar{\rho})u) = 0, \\ (\varrho + \bar{\rho})u_t + (\varrho + \bar{\rho})u \cdot \nabla u + a\nabla[(\varrho + \bar{\rho})(\theta + \bar{e}) - \bar{\rho}\bar{e}] = \mu\Delta u + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u - g\varrho e_3, \\ \theta_t + u \cdot \nabla(\theta + \bar{e}) + a(\theta + \bar{e})\mathrm{div}u = \{\mu|\nabla u + \nabla u^{\mathrm{T}}|^2/2 + \lambda(\mathrm{div}u)^2\}/(\varrho + \bar{\rho}). \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

To complete the statement of the perturbed problem, we specify the initial and boundary conditions:

$$(\varrho, u, \theta)|_{t=0} = (\varrho_0, u_0, \theta_0) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$u(t, x)|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad \text{for any } t > 0. \tag{1.6}$$

Moreover, the initial data should satisfy the compatibility condition

$$\{(\varrho_0 + \bar{\rho})u_0 \cdot \nabla u_0 + a\nabla[(\varrho_0 + \bar{\rho})(\theta_0 + \bar{e}) - \bar{\rho}\bar{e}]\}|_{\partial\Omega} = (\mu\Delta u_0 + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u_0 - g\varrho_0 e_3)|_{\partial\Omega}.$$

If we linearize the equations (1.4) around the steady state $(\bar{\rho}, 0, \bar{e})$, then the resulting linearized equations read as

$$\begin{cases} \varrho_t + \mathrm{div}(\bar{\rho}u) = 0, \\ \bar{\rho}u_t + a\nabla(\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta) = \mu\Delta u + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u - g\varrho e_3, \\ \theta_t + \bar{e}'u_3 + a\bar{e}\mathrm{div}u = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

The RT instability is well-known as gravity-driven instability in fluid dynamics when a heavy fluid is on top of a light one. Instability of the linearized problem (i.e. linear instability) for an incompressible fluid was first introduced by Rayleigh in 1883 [30]. In the recent years, the study on the mathematical theory of the RT instability for fluid dynamics and magnetohydrodynamics (MHD), based on the (generalized) variational method, has attracted much attention, and some progress has been made. In 2003, Hwang and Guo [15] first proved the nonlinear RT instability of $\|(\varrho, u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ in the sense of Hadamard for a 2D nonhomogeneous incompressible inviscid fluid with boundary condition $u\cdot n|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, where $\Omega = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -l < x_2 < m\}$ and n denotes the outer normal vector to $\partial\Omega$. Later, Jiang, Jiang and Ni [18] showed the nonlinear RT instability of $\|u_3\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ for the Cauchy problem of nonhomogeneous incompressible viscous flows in the sense of the Lipschitz structure, and further gave the nonlinear RT instability of $\|u_3\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ in [19] in the sense of Hadamard in a unbounded horizontal period domain Ω. In addition, similar results on the nonlinear RT instability were established for two layer incompressible viscous fluids with a free interface (so-called stratified fluids), where the RT steady-state solution is a denser fluid lying above a lighter one separated by a free interface and the domain is also a flat domain (such as $\mathbb{R}^3$ and a horizontal period domain), please see [29, 32]. We mention that the analogue of the RT instability arises when fluids are electrically conducting and a magnetic field is present, and the growth of the instability will be influenced by the magnetic field due to the generated electromagnetic induction and the Lorentz force. The aforementioned partial results of the RT instability have been extended to the case of MHD fluids by circumventing additional difficulties induced by presence of the magnetic field, see [3, 19, 20] for examples.

All the above mentioned results are obtained for a flat or horizontal period domain, because in such a case one can apply the method of the Fourier transform (or discrete mode-$e^{i\xi\cdot x}$) to analyze properties of spectrums of the associated linearized problems. This basic technique has also been applied to the instability study for other problems, for example, for the periodic BGK equilibria [10], for the space periodic quasi-geostrophic equation [4], for an ideal space periodic fluid [5, 8, 31] and for the space periodic and whole space forced incompressible MHD equations [2, 7]. Recently, Guo and Tice [12] used a modified variational method to investigate a ODE problem arising in the investigation of the linear RT instability for compressible stratified flows. Motivated by their work, Jiang and Jiang [17] adapted the modified variational method to avoid the Fourier transform and constructed the unstable linear solutions of a nonhomogeneous incompressible viscous flow in a general bounded domain Ω, and they proved the nonlinear RT instability by developing a new energy functional to overcome the difficulty induced by the compatibility conditions on boundary under the restriction

$$\inf_{x\in\Omega}\{\bar{\rho}'(x)\} > 0. \tag{1.8}$$

In contrast to the incompressible fluid case, there are very few results on the nonlinear RT instability for compressible flows which are much more complicated and involved to deal with mathematically due to the difficulties induced by compressibility, and hence, new techniques have to be employed (see Remarks 1.1, 1.3 and the paragraph below Remark 1.4 for more comments). In [14] Hwang investigated the nonlinear RT instability of a compressible inviscid MHD fluid in a period domain. We also mention that there are some articles studying the the role of the compressibility effects on the linear RT instability, we refer to [6, 11, 13, 22–24] for more details.

The above mentioned nonlinear RT instability results are concerned either with incompressible flows or with compressible isentropic flows for a spatially periodic domain. To our best knowledge, there is no result on the nonlinear RT instability in compressible non-isentropic flows in a general bounded domains. In this paper we shall prove the nonlinear RT instability for the initial-

boundary problem (1.4)–(1.6) of a compressible non-isentropic flow without heat diffusion in a general bounded domain in the sense of Hadamard. Moreover, we shall show that the sharp growth rate of solutions to the linearized problem (1.7) is not less than that of the solutions in the corresponding incompressible fluid case [17], this means that that the compressibility does not have a stabilizing effect in the linearized problem (1.5)–(1.7) (also see Remark 1.2). Besides, the condition (1.8) is not needed in the proof of the nonlinear instability. The current work is a further continuation of our previous studies [17] where incompressible fluids were investigated.

Before stating the main result of this paper, we explain the notations used throughout this paper. For simplicity, we drop the domain Ω in Sobolve spaces and the corresponding norms as well as in integrands over Ω, for example,

$$L^p := L^p(\Omega), \quad H_0^1 := W_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \ \ H^k := W^{k,2}(\Omega), \ \ \int := \int_\Omega .$$

In addition, a product space $(X)^n$ of vector functions are still denoted by X, for examples, the vector function $u \in (H^2)^3$ is denoted by $u \in H^2$ with norm $\|u\|_{H^2} := (\sum_{k=1}^3 \|u_k\|_{H^2}^2)^{1/2}$. We shall use the abbreviations:

$$D^k := \{\partial_{x_1}^{k_1}\partial_{x_2}^{k_2}\partial_{x_3}^{k_3}\}_{k_1+k_2+k_3=k}, \quad |||D^k f||| := \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3=k} |||\partial_{x_1}^{k_1}\partial_{x_2}^{k_2}\partial_{x_3}^{k_3} f||| \ \text{ for some norm } |||\cdot|||.$$

Now we are able to state our main result on the nonlinear RT instability of the problem (1.4)–(1.6).

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that the RT density profile $\bar\rho$ and the steady internal energy $\bar e$ satisfy (1.2)–(1.3). Then, the steady state $(\bar\rho, 0, \bar e)$ of the system (1.4)–(1.6) is unstable in the Hadamard sense, that is, there are positive constants Λ, m_0, ε and δ_0, and functions $(\bar\varrho_0, \bar u_0, \bar\theta_0, u_{\rm r}) \in H^3$, such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ and the initial data*

$$(\varrho_0, u_0, \theta_0) := \delta(\bar\varrho_0, \bar u_0, \bar\theta_0) + \delta^2(\bar\varrho_0, u_{\rm r}, \bar\theta_0) \in H^3,$$

there is a unique solution $(\varrho, u, \theta) \in C^0([0, T^{\max}), H^3)$ of (1.4)–(1.6) satisfying the compatibility condition and

$$\|(u_1, u_2)(T^\delta)\|_{L^2}, \ \ \|u_3(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} \ge \varepsilon \tag{1.9}$$

for some escape time $T^\delta := \frac{1}{\Lambda}\ln\frac{2\varepsilon}{m_0\delta} \in (0, T^{\max})$, where $T^{\max}$ denotes the maximal time of existence of the solution (ϱ, u, θ), and u_i denotes the i-th component of $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)^{\rm T}$.

Remark 1.1. Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, if we further assume that

$$\bar\rho' \ge 0, \tag{1.10}$$

then we can get the instability of the perturbed density, i.e., Thoerm 1.1 holds with $\|\varrho(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} \ge \varepsilon$. The additional condition (1.10) is used to show $\tilde\varrho_0 := \mathrm{div}(\bar\rho\tilde v_0) \not\equiv 0$ in the conctruction of a linear unstable solution (cf. (2.9)), where $(\tilde\varrho_0, \tilde v_0)$ is a solution to the time-independent system (2.1). It is not clear to the authors whether one could get $\tilde\varrho_0 \not\equiv 0$ without the condition (1.10). In the incompressible fluid case, however, we can obtain $\tilde\varrho_0 \not\equiv 0$ without (1.10).

Remark 1.2. The constant $\Lambda > 0$ in Theorem 1.1 is called sharp growth rate, since any solution $(\hat\varrho, \hat u, \hat\theta)$ to (1.5)–(1.7) satisfies $\|(\hat\varrho, \hat u, \hat\theta)(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \le Ce^{2\Lambda t}\|(\varrho_0, u_0, \theta_0)\|_{H^2}^2$ for some constant C (see Appendix). Moreover, it is unique defined by the relation (2.22). Recently, we proved the

nonlinear RT instability in nonhomogeneous incompressible viscous fluids in [17], where the sharp growth rate $\Lambda_{\rm inc}$ is defined by

$$\Lambda_{\rm inc}^2 := \sup_{\tilde{v}\in\{H_0^1 \ | \ {\rm div}u=0,\ \int\bar{\rho}|\tilde{v}|^2=1\}} \left\{ g\int \bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_3^2 {\rm d}x - \Lambda_{\rm inc}\mu\int |\nabla\tilde{v}|^2 {\rm d}x \right\}.$$

If we consider the incompressible fluid case corresponding to (1.5)–(1.7), we easily find that $\Lambda_{\rm inc}$ is also the sharp growth rate of the incompressible fluid case corresponding to (1.5)–(1.7). On the other hand, by the relation (2.22), one easily gets $\Lambda \geq \Lambda_{\rm inc}$ by contradiction. Hence, we can conclude that the compressibility does not have a stabilizing effect in the linearized problem for compressible non-isentropic flows without heat conductivity.

Remark 1.3. Let $\bar{e} > 0$ be a constant and $\bar{\rho}$ satisfy

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega}\bar{\rho}' < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla\bar{p} = -\bar{\rho}ge_3,$$

then the linearized system (1.5)–(1.7) around $(\bar{\rho}, 0, \bar{e})$ is stable, more precisely, any solution to the system (1.5)–(1.7) satisfies

$$\int\left(\frac{\varrho^2}{-\bar{\rho}'}+\frac{\bar{\rho}u^2}{g}+\frac{\bar{\rho}\theta^2}{g\bar{e}}\right){\rm d}x + \int_0^t\int\left(\frac{2\mu}{g}|\nabla u|^2+\frac{2\mu_0}{g}|{\rm div}u|^2\right){\rm d}x{\rm d}t = \int\left(\frac{\varrho_0^2}{-\bar{\rho}'}+\frac{\bar{\rho}u_0^2}{g}+\frac{\bar{\rho}\theta_0^2}{g\bar{e}}\right){\rm d}x.$$

However, it is not clear to authors whether the corresponding nonlinear system (1.4)–(1.6) around the state $(\bar{\rho}, 0, \bar{e})$ is stable, even if $\bar{\rho}'$ is a positive constant. We mention that the stability of a nonhomogeneous incompressible viscous flow around some steady state $(\bar{\rho}, 0)$ with $\bar{\rho}'$ being a positive constant was shown by making use of the incompressible condition ${\rm div}u = 0$, see [17, Theorem 1.2] for details.

Remark 1.4. We remark that our results can not be generalized to the case with heat conduction, i.e., adding the term $\kappa_\nu\Delta e$ to the right hand of the equation $(1.4)_3$, where $\kappa_\nu = \kappa/c_\nu$, and κ is the heat conductivity coefficient and c_ν is the specific heat at constant volume, since there does not exist a steady solution $(\bar{\rho}, 0, \bar{e})$ satisfying (1.2), (1.3) and $\Delta\bar{e} = 0$. In fact, if such a steady solution existed, then $\bar{e}$ would enjoy the form:

$$\bar{e} = c_1\int 1{\rm d}s = -g(a\bar{\rho}(x_3))^{-1}\int\bar{\rho}(x_3){\rm d}x_3 > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \text{for some constant } c_1 > 0.$$

Thus, one has $-g\int\bar{\rho}(x_3){\rm d}x_3 = ac_1\bar{\rho}(x_3)\int 1{\rm d}x_3$, whence,

$$0 > -g\bar{\rho}(x_3) = ac_1\bar{\rho}(x_3) + ac_1\bar{\rho}'(x_3)\int 1{\rm d}x_3 = ac_1\bar{\rho}(x_3) + a\bar{\rho}'\bar{e}(x_3) > 0 \quad \text{for} \ \ x_3 = x_3^0,$$

which obviously is a contradiction.

Next, we sketch the main idea in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof is broken up into three steps. Firstly, as in [17] we make the following ansatz of growing mode solutions to the linearized problem:

$$(\varrho(x,t), u(x,t), \theta(x,t)) = e^{\Lambda t}(\tilde{\rho}(x), \tilde{v}(x), \tilde{\theta}(x)) \quad \text{for some } \Lambda > 0 \tag{1.11}$$

and deduce (1.7) thus into a time-independent PDE system on the unknown function $\tilde{v}$. Then we adapt and modify the modified variational method in [12] to the time-independent system

to get a non-trivial solution $\tilde{v}$ with a sharp growth rate Λ, which immediately implies that the linearized problem has a unstable solution in the form (1.11). This idea was used probably first by Guo and Tice to deal with an ODE problem arising in constructing unstable linear solutions, and later adapted by other researchers to treat other linear instability problems of viscous fluids, see [16, 20]. Here we directly adapt this idea to the time-independent PDE system to avoid the use of the Fourier transform and to relax the restriction on domains. Secondly, we establish energy estimates of Gronwall-type in H^3-norm. Similar (global in time) estimates were obtained for the non-isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with heat conductivity under the condition of small initial data and external forces [26, 27]. Here we have to modify the arguments in [26, 27] to deal with the compressible Navier-Stokes equations without heat conductivity. Namely, we control the sum $\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta$ as one term (see (3.16)) instead of dividing it into two terms in [27]; and we use the equations $(1.4)_1$ and $(1.4)_2$ independently to bound $\|\varrho\|_{H^3}$ and $\|\theta\|_{H^3}$ (i.e. Lemma 3.1), rather than coupling the equations together to bound $\|\varrho\|_{H^3}$ in [27]. With these slight modifications in techniques, we can get the desired estimates. Finally, we use the frame of bootstrap arguments in [9] to show Theorem 1.1 and we have to circumvent two additional difficulties due to presence of boundary which do not appear for spatially periodic problems considered in [9]: (i) The idea of Duhamel's principle on the linear solution operator in [9] can not be directly applied here to our boundary problem, since the nonlinear term in $(1.4)_2$ does not vanish on boundary. To overcome this trouble, we employ some specific energy estimates to replace Duhamel's principle (see Lemma 4.2 on the error estimate for $\|(\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}, u^{\mathrm{d}}, \theta^{\mathrm{d}})\|_{L^2}^2$). (ii) At the boundary the initial data of the linearized problem may not satisfy the compatibility condition imposed for the initial data of the corresponding nonlinear system (1.4)–(1.6). To circumvent this difficulty, we use the elliptic theory to construct initial data of (1.4)–(1.6) that satisfy the compatibility condition and are close to the initial data of the linearized problem. We also mention that in [17] the authors got around a similar problem of compatibility conditions for incompressible flows by imposing the condition (1.8) and introducing a new energy functional to show that the initial data of the linearized problem can be used as the initial data of the corresponding nonlinear incompressible system.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we construct unstable linear solutions, while in Section 3 we deduce the nonlinear energy estimates. Section 4 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.1, and finally, in Appendix we give a proof of the sharp growth rate of solutions to the linearized problem in H^2-norm.

2. Linear instability

In this section, we adapt the modified variational method in [12] to construct a solution to the linearized equations (1.7) that has growing H^3-norm in time. We first make a solution ansatz (1.11) of growing normal mode. Substituting this ansatz into (1.7), one obtains the following time-independent system:

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda\tilde{\rho} + \mathrm{div}(\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}) = 0, \\ \Lambda\bar{\rho}\tilde{v} + a\nabla(\bar{e}\tilde{\rho} + \bar{\rho}\tilde{\theta}) = \mu\Delta\tilde{v} + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}\tilde{v} - g\tilde{\rho}e_3, \\ \Lambda\tilde{\theta} + \bar{e}'\tilde{v}_3 + a\bar{e}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v} = 0, \\ \tilde{v}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Eliminating $\tilde{\varrho}$ and $\tilde{\theta}$, one has

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda^2\bar{\rho}\tilde{v} + \nabla(g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_3 - (1+a)\bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}) = \Lambda\mu\Delta\tilde{v} + \Lambda\mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}\tilde{v} + (g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_3 + g\bar{\rho}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v})e_3, \\ \tilde{v}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\tilde{v}$ denotes the third component of v. In view of the basic idea of the modified variational method, we modify the boundary problem (2.2) as follows.

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda^2\bar{\rho}\tilde{v} + \nabla(g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_3 - (1+a)\bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}) = s\mu\Delta\tilde{v} + s\mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}\tilde{v} + (g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_3 + g\bar{\rho}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v})e_3, \\ \tilde{v}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

We remark that if $s = \Lambda$ (fixed point), then the problem (2.3) becomes (2.2).

Now, multiplying $(2.3)_1$ by $\tilde{v}$ and integrating the resulting identity, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^2 \int \bar{\rho}|\tilde{v}|^2 = &\int \{g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_3^2 + [2g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_3 - (1+a)\bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}]\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}\}\mathrm{d}x \\ &- s\int \left(\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}|^2 + \mu_0|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

We define

$$E_1(\tilde{v}) = \int \{g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_3^2 + [2g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_3 - (1+a)\bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}]\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}\}\mathrm{d}x,$$

and

$$E_2(\tilde{v}) = \int (\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}|^2 + \mu_0|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}|^2)\mathrm{d}x.$$

Then the standard energy functional for the problem (2.3) is given by

$$E(\tilde{v}) = E_1(\tilde{v}) - sE_2(\tilde{v}) \tag{2.5}$$

with an associated admissible set

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ \tilde{v} \in H_0^1 \;\middle|\; J(\tilde{v}) := \int \bar{\rho}\tilde{v}^2\mathrm{d}x = 1 \right\}. \tag{2.6}$$

Recalling (2.4), we can thus find Λ by maximizing

$$\Lambda^2 := \sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v}). \tag{2.7}$$

Obviously, $\sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v}) < \infty$ for any $s \geq 0$. In order to emphasize the dependence of $E(\tilde{v})$ upon $s > 0$, we shall sometimes write

$$E(\tilde{v}, s) := E(\tilde{v}) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(s) := \sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v}, s).$$

Next we show that a maximizer of (2.7) exists and that the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations are equivalent to (2.3).

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{e})$ satisfies (1.2)–(1.3), then for any but fixed $s > 0$, the following assertions hold.*

(1) $E(\tilde{v})$ achieves its supremum on $\mathcal{A}$.

(2) Let $\tilde{v}_0$ be a maximizer and $\Lambda := \sqrt{\sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v})} > 0$, then there exists a function $\tilde{v}_0 \in H^4$ satisfying the boundary problem (2.3) and

$$\tilde{v}_{01}^2 + \tilde{v}_{02}^2 \not\equiv 0. \tag{2.8}$$

In addition

$$\mathrm{div}(\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_0) \not\equiv 0, \ \textit{provided } \bar{\rho}' \geq 0. \tag{2.9}$$

PROOF. (1) Let $\tilde{v}_n \in \mathcal{A}$ be a maximizing sequence, then $E(\tilde{v}_n)$ is bounded from below. This fact together with (2.6) implies that $\tilde{v}_n$ is bounded in H^1. So, there exists a $\tilde{v}_0 \in H^1 \cap \mathcal{A}$ and a subsequence (still denoted by v_n for simplicity), such that $\tilde{v}_n \to \tilde{v}_0$ weakly in H^1 and strongly in L^2. Moreover, by the lower semi-continuity, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v}) =& \limsup_{n\to\infty} E(\tilde{v}_n)\\ =& \lim_{n\to\infty}\int (g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_{n3}^2 + 2g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_{n3}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_n)\mathrm{d}x\\ &- \liminf_{n\to\infty}\int [(1+a)\bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_n\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_n + s\left(\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}_n|^2 + \mu_0|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_n|^2\right)]\mathrm{d}x\\ \le& E(\tilde{v}_0) \le \sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v}),\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $E(\tilde{v})$ achieves its supremum on $\mathcal{A}$.

(2) To show the second assertion, we notice that since $E(\tilde{v})$ and $J(\tilde{v})$ are homogeneous of degree 2, (2.7) is equivalent to

$$\Lambda^2 = \sup_{\tilde{v}\in H_0^1} \frac{E(\tilde{v})}{J(\tilde{v})}. \tag{2.10}$$

For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w \in H_0^1$, we take $\tilde{w}(\tau) := \tilde{v}_0 + \tau w$. Then (2.10) gives

$$E(\tilde{w}(\tau)) - \Lambda^2 J(\tilde{w}(\tau)) \le 0.$$

If we set $I(\tau) = E(\tilde{w}(\tau)) - \Lambda^2 J(\tilde{w}(\tau))$, then we see that $I(\tau) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, $I(\tau) \le 0$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $I(0) = 0$. This implies $I'(0) = 0$. Hence, a direct computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega \{s\mu\nabla\tilde{v}_0 : \nabla w + [s\mu_0 + (1+a)\bar{p}]\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_0\mathrm{div}w\}\mathrm{d}x\\ &= \int_\Omega [g\bar{\rho}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_0 e_3 + g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_{03}e_3 - \nabla(g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_{03}) - \Lambda^2\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_0]\cdot\tilde{w}\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

which shows that $\tilde{v}$ is a weak solution to the boundary problem (2.3). Recalling that $0 < p \in C^4(\bar{\Omega})$, $\bar{\rho} \in C^4(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\tilde{v}_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$, by a bootstrap argument and the classical elliptic theory, we infer from the weak form (2.11) that $\tilde{v}_0 \in H^4(\Omega)$.

Next we turn to the proof of (2.8) and (2.9) by contradiction. Suppose that $\tilde{v}_{01}^2 + \tilde{v}_{02}^2 \equiv 0$ or $\mathrm{div}(\bar{\varrho}\tilde{v}_0) \equiv 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}0 < \Lambda^2 =& \int \{g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_{03}^2 + [2g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_{03} - (1+a)\bar{p}\partial_{x_3}\tilde{v}_{03}]\partial_{x_3}\tilde{v}_{03}\}\mathrm{d}x - s\int \left(\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}_{03}|^2 + \mu_0|\partial_{x_3}\tilde{v}_{03}|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\\ =& -\int (1+a)\bar{p}|\partial_{x_3}\tilde{v}_{03}|^2\mathrm{d}x - s\int \left(\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}_{03}|^2 + \mu_0|\partial_{x_3}\tilde{v}_{03}|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x < 0,\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}0 < \Lambda^2 =& \int \{g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_{03}^2 + [2g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_{03} - (1+a)\bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_0]\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_0\}\mathrm{d}x - s\int \left(\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}_0|^2 + \mu_0|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_0|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\\ =& -\int [g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_{03}^2 + (1+a)\bar{p}|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_0|^2]\mathrm{d}x - s\int \left(\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}_0|^2 + \mu_0|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}_0|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x < 0,\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

which contradicts. Therefore, (2.8) and (2.9) hold. This completes the proof. □

Next, we want to show that there is a fixed point such that $\Lambda = s > 0$. To this end, we first give some properties of $\alpha(s)$ as a function of $s > 0$.

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{e})$ satisfies (1.2)–(1.3). Then the function $\alpha(s)$ defined on $(0, \infty)$ enjoys the following properties:*

(1) *$\alpha(s) \in C^{0,1}_{\rm loc}(0, \infty)$ is nonincreasing.*
(2) *There are constants c_1, $c_2 > 0$ which depend on g, $\bar{\rho}$ and μ, such that*

$$\alpha(s) \geq c_1 - sc_2. \tag{2.14}$$

Proof. (1) Let $\{\tilde{v}^n_{s_i}\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a maximizing sequence of $\sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v}, s_i) = \alpha(s_i)$ for $i = 1$ and 2. Then

$$\alpha(s_1) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} E(\tilde{v}^n_{s_2}, s_1) \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} E(\tilde{v}^n_{s_2}, s_2) = \alpha(s_2) \ \text{ for any } 0 < s_1 < s_2 < \infty.$$

Hence $\alpha(s)$ is nonincreasing on $(0, \infty)$. Next we use this fact to show the continuity of $\alpha(s)$.

Let $I := [b, c] \subset (0, \infty)$ be a bounded interval. Noting that, by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E(\tilde{v}) \leq& \int (g\bar{\rho}'\tilde{v}_3^2 + 2g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}_3 \mathrm{div}\tilde{v})\mathrm{d}x - (1+a)\int \bar{p}|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}|^2\mathrm{d}x \\ \leq& g\left[\left\|\frac{\bar{\rho}'}{\bar{\rho}}\right\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{g}{(1+a)}\left\|\frac{\bar{\rho}}{\bar{p}}\right\|_{L^\infty}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the monotonicity of $\alpha(s)$ we have

$$|\alpha(s)| \leq \max\left\{|\alpha(b)|, g\left[\left\|\frac{\bar{\rho}'}{\bar{\rho}}\right\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{g}{(1+a)}\left\|\frac{\bar{\rho}}{\bar{p}}\right\|_{L^\infty}\right]\right\} := L < \infty \quad \text{for any } s \in I. \tag{2.15}$$

On the other hand, for any $s \in I$, there exists a maximizing sequence $\{\tilde{v}^n_s\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ of $\sup_{\tilde{v}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{v}, s)$, such that

$$|\alpha(s) - E(\tilde{v}^n_s, s)| < 1. \tag{2.16}$$

Making use of (2.5), (2.15) and (2.16), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq& \int \left(\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}|^2 + \mu_0|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x \\ =& \frac{1}{s}\int \{g\bar{\rho}'|\tilde{v}^n_{s3}|^2 + [2g\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}^n_{s3} - (1+a)\bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}^n_s]\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}^n_s\}\mathrm{d}x - \frac{E(\tilde{v}^n_s, s)}{s} \\ \leq& \frac{1+L}{b} + \frac{g}{b}\left[\left\|\frac{\bar{\rho}'}{\bar{\rho}}\right\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{g}{(1+a)}\left\|\frac{\bar{\rho}}{\bar{p}}\right\|_{L^\infty}\right] := K. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $s_i \in I$ $(i = 1, 2)$, we further find that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(s_1) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} E(\tilde{v}^n_{s_1}, s_1) \leq& \limsup_{n\to\infty} E(\tilde{v}^n_{s_1}, s_2) \\ &+ |s_1 - s_2| \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega (\mu|\nabla\tilde{v}^n_{s_1}|^2 + \mu_0|\mathrm{div}\tilde{v}^n_{s_1}|^2)\mathrm{d}x \\ \leq& \alpha(s_2) + K|s_1 - s_2|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Reversing the role of the indices 1 and 2 in the derivation of the inequality (2.17), we obtain the same boundedness with the indices switched. Therefore, we deduce that

$$|\alpha(s_1) - \alpha(s_2)| \le K|s_1 - s_2|,$$

which yields $\alpha(s) \in C^{0,1}_{\rm loc}(0,\infty)$.

(2) We turn to prove (2.14). First we construct a function $v \in H^1_0$, such that

$$\mathrm{div} v = 0, \quad \int \bar\rho' v_3^2 \mathrm{d}x > 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Noting that since $\bar\rho'(x_3^0) > 0$ for some point $x_3^0 \in \{x_3 \mid (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \Omega\}$, there is a ball $B^\delta_{x_0} := \{x \mid |x - x_0| < \delta\} \subset \Omega$, such that $\bar\rho' > 0$ on $B^\delta_{x_0}$. Now, choose a smooth function $f(r) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, such that

$$f(r) = -f(-r),\ |f(r)| > 0 \text{ if } 0 < |r| < \delta/4, \text{ and } f(r) = 0 \text{ if } |r| \ge \delta/4,$$

and define then

$$\bar v(x) := f(x_1)\left(0, -f(x_3)\int_{-\delta/4}^{x_2} f(r)\mathrm{d}r, f(x_2)\int_{-\delta/4}^{x_3} f(r)\mathrm{d}r\right).$$

It is easy to check that the non-zero function $\bar v(x) \in H^1_0(B^\delta_0)$, thus $v := u(x - x_0) \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ and satisfies (2.18)

With (2.18) to hand, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(s) =& \sup_{\tilde v \in \mathcal{A}} E(\tilde v, s) = \sup_{\tilde v \in H^1_0} \frac{E(\tilde v, s)}{J(\tilde v)} \\ &\ge \frac{E(v,s)}{J(v)} = \frac{g\int \bar\rho' v_3^2 \mathrm{d}x}{\int \bar\rho v^2 \mathrm{d}x} - s\frac{\mu \int |\nabla v|^2 \mathrm{d}x}{\int \bar\rho v^2 \mathrm{d}x} := c_1 - sc_2\end{aligned}$$

for two positive constants $c_1 := c_1(g, \bar\rho)$ and $c_2 := c_2(g, \mu, \bar\rho)$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.2. □

Next we show that there exists a function $\tilde v$ satisfying (2.2) with a grow rate Λ. Let

$$\mathfrak{S} := \sup\{s \mid \alpha(\tau) > 0 \text{ for any } \tau \in (0, s)\}.$$

By virtue of Proposition 2.2, $\mathfrak{S} > 0$; and moreover, $\alpha(s) > 0$ for any $s < \mathfrak{S}$. Since $\alpha(s) = \sup_{\tilde v \in \mathcal{A}} E(\tilde v, s) < \infty$, we make use of the monotonicity of $\alpha(s)$ to deduce that

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \alpha(s) \text{ exists and the limit is a positve constant.} \tag{2.19}$$

On the other hand, by virtue of Poincáre's inequality, there is a constant c_3 dependent of g, $\bar\rho$ and Ω, such that

$$g\int (\bar\rho' \tilde v_3^2 + 2\bar\rho \tilde v_3 \mathrm{div}\tilde v)\mathrm{d}x \le c_3 \int |\nabla \tilde v|^2 \mathrm{d}x \quad \text{ for any } \tilde v \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Thus, if $s > c_3/\mu$, then

$$g\int (\bar\rho' \tilde v_3^2 + 2\bar\rho \tilde v_3 \mathrm{div}\tilde v)\mathrm{d}x - s\mu \int |\nabla \tilde v|^2 \mathrm{d}x < 0 \quad \text{ for any } \tilde v \in \mathcal{A},$$

which implies that

$$\alpha(s) \le 0 \quad \text{for any } s > c_3/\mu.$$

Hence $\mathfrak{S} < \infty$, and moreover,

$$\lim_{s\to\mathfrak{S}} \alpha(s) = 0. \tag{2.20}$$

Now, employing a fixed-point argument, exploiting (2.19), (2.20), and the continuity of $\alpha(s)$ on $(0, \mathfrak{S})$, we find that there exists a unique $\Lambda \in (0, \mathfrak{S})$, such that

$$\Lambda = \sqrt{\alpha(\Lambda)} = \sqrt{\sup_{\tilde{w}\in\mathcal{A}} E(\tilde{w}, \Lambda)} > 0. \tag{2.21}$$

In view of Proposition 2.1, there is a solution $\tilde{v} \in H^4$ to the boundary problem (2.3) with Λ constructed in (2.21). Moreover, $\Lambda^2 = E(\tilde{v}, \Lambda)$, $\tilde{v}_1^2 + \tilde{v}_2^2 \not\equiv 0$ and $\tilde{v}_3 \not\equiv 0$ by (2.21) and (2.5). In addition, $\mathrm{div}(\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}) \not\equiv 0$ provided $\bar{\rho}' \ge 0$. Thus we have proved

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{e})$ satisfies (1.2)–(1.3). Then there exists a $\tilde{v} \in H^4$ satisfying the boundary problem (2.2) with a growth rate $\Lambda > 0$ defined by*

$$\Lambda^2 = \sup_{\tilde{w}\in H_0^1(\Omega)} \frac{E_1(\tilde{w}) - \Lambda E_2(\tilde{w})}{\int \bar{\rho}|\tilde{w}|^2 \mathrm{d}x}. \tag{2.22}$$

Moreover, $\tilde{v}$ satisfies $\mathrm{div}(\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}) \not\equiv 0$, $\tilde{v}_1^2 + \tilde{v}_2^2 \not\equiv 0$ and $\tilde{v}_3 \not\equiv 0$. In particular, let $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\theta}) := -(\mathrm{div}(\bar{\rho}\tilde{v}), \bar{\rho}\bar{e}'\tilde{v}_3 + \bar{p}\mathrm{div}\tilde{v})/\Lambda$, then $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) \in H^3$ satisfies (2.1). In addition, $\tilde{\rho} \not\equiv 0$ provided $\bar{\rho}' \ge 0$.

As a result of Proposition 2.3, one immediately gets the following linear instability.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{e})$ satisfies (1.2)–(1.3). Then the steady state $(\bar{\rho}, 0, \bar{e})$ of the linearized system (1.5)–(1.7) is linearly unstable. That is, there exists an unstable solution*

$$(\varrho, u, \theta) := e^{\Lambda t}(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta})$$

to (1.5)–(1.7), such that $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) \in H^3$ and

$$\|(u_1, u_2)(t)\|_{L^2} \text{ and } \|u_3(t)\|_{L^2} \to \infty \text{ as } t \to \infty,$$

where the constant growth rate Λ is the same as in Proposition 2.3. Moreover, $\tilde{\rho} \not\equiv 0$ provided $\bar{\rho}' \ge 0$.

3. Nonlinear energy estimates

In this section, we derive some nonlinear energy estimates for the perturbed Cauchy problem (1.4)–(1.6) and an estimate of Gronwall-type in H^3-norm, which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the next section. To this end, let (ϱ, u, θ) be a solution of the perturbed problem (1.4)–(1.6), such that

$$\mathcal{E}(t) := \mathcal{E}(\varrho, u, \theta)(t) := \|(\varrho, u, \theta)(t)\|_{H^3} \tag{3.1}$$

is sufficiently small (the smallness depends on the physical parameters in (1.4)), and

$$0 < \underline{\rho} \le \rho(t, x) \le \bar{\rho} := \varrho + \bar{\rho} < \infty \text{ for any } t \ge 0,\ x \in \Omega,$$

where $\underline{\rho}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ are two constants. We remark here that these assumptions will be repeatedly used in what follows. Moreover, we assume that the solution (ϱ, u, θ) possesses proper regularity, so that the procedure of formal calculations makes sense. For simplicity, we only sketch the outline and shall omit the detailed calculations for which we remind that we shall repeatedly use the Soblev embedding theorem [28, Subsection 1.3.5.8], Young's, Höldear's and Poincaré's inequalities, and the following interpolation inequality [1, Chapter 5]:

$$\|f\|_{H^j} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{j+1}} \|f\|_{H^{j+1}}^{\frac{j}{j+1}} \leq C_\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2} + \epsilon \|f\|_{H^{j+1}} \text{ for any constant } \epsilon > 0.$$

In addition, we shall always use the following abbreviations in what follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}(\varrho_0, u_0, N_0),\\
&\frac{d}{dt} := \partial_t + u \cdot \nabla \ \text{ denotes the material derivative,}\\
&L^\varrho \equiv L^\varrho(\varrho, u) := \varrho_t + \bar{\rho}' u_3 + \bar{\rho} \mathrm{div} u = -\mathrm{div}(\varrho u) := N^\varrho(\varrho, u) \equiv N^\varrho, \qquad (3.2)\\
&L^u \equiv L^u(\varrho, u, \theta) := \bar{\rho} u_t + a\nabla(\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta) - \mu\Delta u - \mu_0 \nabla \mathrm{div} u + g\varrho e_3\\
&\qquad = -(\varrho + \bar{\rho}) u \cdot \nabla u - \varrho u_t - a\nabla(\varrho\theta) := N^u(\varrho, \theta, u) \equiv N^u, \qquad (3.3)\\
&L^\theta \equiv L^\theta(\varrho, u, \theta) := \theta_t + \bar{e}' u_3 + a\bar{e}\mathrm{div} u = -u \cdot \nabla\theta - a\theta \mathrm{div} u\\
&\qquad + [\mu|\nabla u + \nabla(u)^{\mathrm{T}}|^2/2 + \lambda(\mathrm{div} u)^2]/(\varrho + \bar{\rho}) := N^\theta(\varrho, u, \theta) \equiv N^\theta, \qquad (3.4)\\
&\mathcal{R}(t) := \left\| \left(\varrho, \theta, u_t, \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}(\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta) \right) \right\|_{H^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}(\|u\|_{H^3} + \|u\|_{H^4}^2 + \mathcal{E}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

and the symbol $a \lesssim b$ means that $a \leq Cb$ for some constant $C > 0$ which may depend on some physical parameters in the perturbed equations (1.4).

Now, we start to establish a series of lemmas which imply a priori estimates for the perturbed density, velocity and temperature. Firstly, from the following identities

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \int D^k L^\varrho D^k \varrho \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau = \int_0^t \int D^k N^\varrho D^k \varrho \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau,\\
&\int_0^t \int D^k L^\theta D^k \theta \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau = \int_0^t \int D^k N^\theta D^k \theta \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq 3,
\end{aligned}$$

the following estimate on the perturbed density and temperature follows.

Lemma 3.1. *For $0 \leq k \leq 3$, it holds that*

$$\|(\varrho, \theta)\|_{H^k}^2 \lesssim \|(\varrho, \theta)(0)\|_{H^k}^2 + \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(\|u\|_{H^{k+1}} + \mathcal{E}^2)\mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Secondly, we control the perturbed velocity. Since the viscosity term of (3.3) defines a strongly elliptic operator on u, we have for $u \in H^k \cap H_0^1$ $(1 \leq k \leq 3)$ that

$$\|u\|_{H^k}^2 \lesssim \|\mu\Delta u + \mu_0 \nabla \mathrm{div} u\|_{H^{k-2}}^2. \qquad (3.5)$$

Thus, applying (3.5) to the system

$$-\mu\Delta u - \mu_0 \nabla \mathrm{div} u = N^u - \bar{\rho} u_t - g\varrho e_3 - a\nabla(\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta), \qquad (3.6)$$

one concludes that

Lemma 3.2. *It holds that*

$$\|u\|_{H^3}^2 \lesssim \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2 + \|(\varrho,\theta)\|_{H^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}^4.$$

Thirdly, we bound the time-derivative of the perturbed velocity.

Lemma 3.3. *It holds that*

$$\|(\varrho,\theta)_t\|_{H^k}^2 \lesssim \|u\|_{H^{k+1}}^2 + \mathcal{E}^4 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2 \quad \text{for } 0 \le k \le 2, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\|u_t(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \lesssim \|Du_t(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t (\|u\|_{H^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}^4)\mathrm{d}\tau, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\|u_t(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \lesssim \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{H^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}^4. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. The inequality (3.7) follows directly from (3.2) and (3.4). By (3.3), we see that

$$\|u_t\|_{H^1}^2 \lesssim \|(\varrho,\theta)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u\|_{H^3}^2 + \mathcal{E}^4 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2. \tag{3.10}$$

Hence, using (3.7) with $k=1$, (3.10) and Poincaré's inequality, we get (3.8) from

$$\int_0^t \int L_t^u \cdot u_{tt} \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau = \int_0^t \int N_t^u \cdot u_{tt} \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Finally, applying (3.5) to ∂_t(3.6) and making use of (3.7) and (3.10), we obtain (3.9). □

Fourthly, we establish the interior estimates of higher-order mass derivatives of $\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta$. Let χ_0 be an arbitrary but fixed function in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. Then, recalling the equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \int \left(\frac{a\chi_0^2 \bar{e}}{\bar{\rho}} D^k L^\varrho D^k \varrho + \chi_0^2 D^k L^u \cdot D^k u + \frac{\chi_0^2 \bar{\rho}}{\bar{e}} D^k L^\theta D^k \theta \right) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= \int_0^t \int \left(\frac{\chi_0^2 \bar{e}}{\bar{\rho}} D^k N^\varrho D^k \varrho + \chi_0^2 D^k N^u \cdot D^k u + \frac{\chi_0^2 \bar{\rho}}{\bar{e}} D^k N^\theta D^k \theta \right) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau,
\end{aligned}$$

one obtains

Lemma 3.4. *For $1 \le k \le 3$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\chi_0 D^k(\varrho,u,\theta)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \left(\|\chi_0 D^{k+1} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \chi_0 D^k \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} (\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t \mathcal{R} \mathrm{d}\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Fifthly, let us establish the estimates near the boundary. Similarly to that in [25, 27], we choose a finite number of bounded open sets $\{O_j\}_{j=1}^N$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, such that $\cup_{j=1}^N O_j \supset \partial\Omega$. In each open set O_j we choose the local coordinates (ψ,ϕ,r) as follows:

(1) The surface $O_j \cap \partial\Omega$ is the image of a smooth vector function $y = (y^1,y^2,y^3)(\psi,\phi)$ (e.g., take the local geodesic polar coordinate), satisfying $|y_\psi| = 1$, $y_\psi \cdot y_\phi = 0$, and $|y_\phi| \ge \delta > 0$, where δ is some positive constant independent of $1 \le j \le N$.

(2) Any $x \in O_j$ is represented by

$$x^i = x^i(\psi, \phi, r) = rn^i(\psi, \phi) + y^i(\psi, \phi), \tag{3.11}$$

where $n = (n^1, n^2, n^3)(\psi, \phi)$ represents the internal unit normal vector at the point of the surface coordinated (ψ, ϕ).

For the simplicity of presentation, we omit the subscript j in what follows. For $k = 1, 2$, we define the unit vector $\tilde{e}_k = (\tilde{e}_k^1, \tilde{e}_k^2, \tilde{e}_k^3)$ by $\tilde{e}_1^i = y_\psi^i$, $\tilde{e}_2^i = y_\phi^i/|y_\phi|$. Then Frenet-Serret's formula implies that there are smooth functions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \alpha', \beta', \gamma'$ of (ψ, ϕ) satisfying

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi}\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{e}_1^i \\ \tilde{e}_2^i \\ n^i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\gamma & -\alpha \\ \gamma & 0 & -\beta \\ \alpha & \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{e}_1^i \\ \tilde{e}_2^i \\ n^i \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{e}_1^i \\ \tilde{e}_2^i \\ n^i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\gamma' & -\alpha' \\ \gamma' & 0 & -\beta' \\ \alpha' & \beta' & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{e}_1^i \\ \tilde{e}_2^i \\ n^i \end{pmatrix}.$$

An elementary calculation shows that the Jacobian J of the transform (3.11) is

$$J = |x_\psi \times x_\phi| = |y_\phi| + (\alpha|y_\phi| + \beta')r + (\alpha\beta' - \beta\alpha')r^2. \tag{3.12}$$

By (3.12), we find the transform (3.11) is regular by choosing r small if needed. Therefore, the functions $(\psi, \phi, r)_{x_i}(x)$ make sense and can be expressed by, using a straightforward calculation,

$$\begin{cases} \psi_{x_i} = \dfrac{1}{J}(x_\phi \times x_r)_i = \dfrac{1}{J}(A\tilde{e}_1^i + Be_2^i), \\ \phi_{x_i} = \dfrac{1}{J}(x_r \times x_\phi)_i = \dfrac{1}{J}(C\tilde{e}_1^i + \tilde{D}\tilde{e}_2^i), \\ r_{x_i} = \dfrac{1}{J}(x_\psi \times x_\phi)_i = n_i, \end{cases} \tag{3.13}$$

where $A = |y_\phi| + \beta' r$, $B = -r\alpha'$, $C = -\beta r$, $\tilde{D} = 1 + \alpha r$ and $J = A\tilde{D} - BC > 0$. Hence, (3.13) gives

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} = \frac{1}{J}(A\tilde{e}_1^i + B\tilde{e}_2^i)\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi} + \frac{1}{J}(C\tilde{e}_1^i + \tilde{D}\tilde{e}_2^i)\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi} + n^i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}.$$

Thus, in each O_j, we can rewrite the equations (3.2)–(3.4) in the local coordinates (ψ, ϕ, r) as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{L}^\varrho := \varrho_t + \text{ zero order terms of } u_3 + \dfrac{\bar{\rho}}{J}[(A\tilde{e}_1 + B\tilde{e}_2)\cdot u_\psi + (C\tilde{e}_1 + \tilde{D}\tilde{e}_2)\cdot u_\phi + Jn\cdot u_r] = N^\varrho \\ \tilde{L}^u := \bar{\rho}u_t - \dfrac{\mu}{J^2}[(A^2 + B^2)u_{\psi\psi} + 2(AC + B\tilde{D})u_{\psi\phi} + (C^2 + \tilde{D}^2)u_{\phi\phi} + J^2u_{rr}] \\ \quad + \text{less two order terms of } u + g\varrho e_3 + \dfrac{1}{J}(A\tilde{e}_1 + B\tilde{e}_2)\left[\dfrac{\mu_0}{\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p}}\dfrac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) + a\bar{e}\varrho + a\bar{\rho}\theta\right]_\psi \\ \quad + \dfrac{1}{J}(C\tilde{e}_1 + \tilde{D}\tilde{e}_2)\left[\dfrac{\mu_0}{\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p}}\dfrac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) + a\bar{e}\varrho + a\bar{\rho}\theta\right]_\phi + n\left[\dfrac{\mu_0}{\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p}}\dfrac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) + a\bar{e}\varrho + a\bar{\rho}\theta\right]_r \\ \quad = N^u + \mu_0\nabla\{[\bar{\rho}(N^\theta + u\cdot\nabla\theta) - \bar{e}\varrho\mathrm{div}u + (\bar{e}'\varrho + \bar{\rho}'\theta)u_3]/(\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p})\} := \tilde{N}^u, \\ \tilde{L}^\theta := \theta_t + \text{ zero order terms of } u_3 + \dfrac{a\bar{e}}{J}[(A\tilde{e}_1 + B\tilde{e}_2)\cdot u_\psi + (C\tilde{e}_1 + \tilde{D}\tilde{e}_2)\cdot u_\phi + Jn\cdot u_r] = N^\theta, \end{cases}$$

where we note that $J^2 = (AC + B\tilde{D})^2 - (A^2 + B^2)(C^2 + \tilde{D}^2)$.

Let χ_j be an arbitrary but fixed function in $C_0^\infty(O_j)$. Estimating the integral

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t \int \left(\frac{a\chi_j^2 \bar{e}}{\bar{\rho}} D_{\psi,\phi}^k \tilde{L}^\varrho D_{\psi,\phi}^k \varrho + \chi_j^2 D_{\psi,\phi}^k \tilde{L}^u \cdot D_{\psi,\phi}^k u + \frac{\chi_j^2 \bar{\rho}}{\bar{e}} D_{\psi,\phi}^k \tilde{L}^\theta D_{\psi,\phi}^k \theta \right) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= \int_0^t \int \left(\frac{a\chi_j^2 \bar{e}}{\bar{\rho}} D_{\psi,\phi}^k N^\varrho D_{\psi,\phi}^k \varrho + \chi_j^2 D_{\psi,\phi}^k \tilde{N}^u \cdot D_{\psi,\phi}^k u + \frac{\chi_j^2 \bar{\rho}}{\bar{e}} D_{\psi,\phi}^k N^\theta D_{\psi,\phi}^k \theta \right) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau\end{aligned}$$

in a way similar to that in Lemma 3.4, we obtain the following estimates on tangential derivatives:

Lemma 3.5. *For $1 \le k \le 3$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\chi_j D_{\psi,\phi}^k (\varrho, u, \theta)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \left(\|\chi_j D_{\psi,\phi}^k Du\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \chi_j D_{\psi,\phi}^k \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} (\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t \mathcal{R} \mathrm{d}\tau,\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\chi_j D_{\psi,\phi}^k f\|_{L^2}^2 := \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \|\chi_j \partial_\psi^{k_1} \partial_\phi^{k_2} f\|_{L^2}^2$.

In order to bound the normal derivatives, we use the equations $D_r(\bar{e}\tilde{L}^\varrho + \bar{\rho}\tilde{L}^\theta - \bar{e}N^\varrho - \bar{\rho}N^\theta) = 0$ and $n \cdot (\tilde{L}^u - \tilde{N}^u) = 0$, which have the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\frac{d}{dt} (\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) \right]_r + \frac{\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p}}{J} [(A\tilde{e}_1 + B\tilde{e}_2) \cdot u_{r\psi} + (C\tilde{e}_1 + \tilde{D}\tilde{e}_2) \cdot u_{r\phi} + Jn \cdot u_{rr}] \\ &\quad + \text{less than second order terms of } u = [\bar{\rho}(N^\theta + u \cdot \nabla\theta) - \bar{e}\varrho \mathrm{div} u + (\bar{e}'\varrho + \bar{\rho}'\theta) u_3]_r\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{\rho} n \cdot u_t - \frac{\mu n}{J^2} \cdot [(A^2 + B^2) u_{\psi\psi} + 2(AC + B\tilde{D}) u_{\psi\phi} + (C^2 + \tilde{D}^2) u_{\phi\phi} + J^2 u_{rr}] \\ &+ \text{less than second order terms of } u + g\varrho e_3 \cdot n + \left[\frac{\mu_0}{\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p}} \frac{d}{dt} (\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) + a\bar{e}\varrho + a\bar{\rho}\theta \right]_r \qquad (3.14) \\ &= n \cdot \tilde{N}^u\end{aligned}$$

Eliminating $\mu n \cdot u_{rr}$ from (3.14), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\frac{(\mu + \mu_0)}{\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p}} \frac{d}{dt} (\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) + a\bar{e}\varrho + a\bar{\rho}\theta \right]_r = -\bar{\rho} n \cdot u_t + \frac{\mu n}{J^2} [(A^2 + B^2) u_{\psi\psi} + 2(AC + B\tilde{D}) u_{\psi\phi} \\ &\quad + (C^2 + \tilde{D}^2) u_{\phi\phi}] - \frac{\mu}{J} [(A\tilde{e}_1 + B\tilde{e}_2) \cdot u_{r\psi} + (C\tilde{e}_1 + D\tilde{e}_2) \cdot u_{r\phi}] + \text{less than second} \qquad (3.15) \\ &\quad \text{order terms of } u + g\varrho e_3 \cdot n = n \cdot \tilde{N}^u + \frac{\mu}{\bar{\rho}\bar{e} + \bar{p}} [\bar{\rho}(N^\theta + u \cdot \nabla\theta) - \bar{e}\varrho \mathrm{div} u + (\bar{e}'\varrho + \bar{\rho}'\theta) u_3]_r.\end{aligned}$$

If we apply $D_{\psi,\phi}^k D_r^l$ $(k + l = 0,\ 1,\ 2)$ to (3.15), multiply then by $\chi_j^2 D_{\psi,\phi}^k D_r^l [d(\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta)/dt]_r$ and $\chi_j^2 D_{\psi,\phi}^k D_r^l (\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta)_r$ respectively, and integrate them, we can bound the derivatives in the normal direction to the boundary as follows.

Lemma 3.6. *For $0 \le k+l \le 2$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi} D^{l+1}_r(\bar{e}\rho+\bar{\rho}\theta)(t)\|^2_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \left\{ \|\chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi} D^{l+1}_r(\bar{e}\rho+\bar{\rho}\theta)\|^2_{L^2} + \left\| \chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi} D^{l+1}_r \left[\frac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho+\bar{\rho}\theta) \right] \right\|^2_{L^2} \right\} \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\lesssim \|(\varrho_0,\theta_0)\|^2_{H^3} + \int_0^t (\|D^{k+1}_{\psi,\phi} D^l_r Du\|^2_{L^2} + \mathcal{R}) \mathrm{d}\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we introduce the following lemma on the stationary Stokes equations to get the estimates on the tangential derivatives of both u and $\bar{e}\varrho+\bar{\rho}\theta$.

Lemma 3.7. *Consider the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\mu\Delta u + a\nabla\sigma = g, \\ \mathrm{div} u = f, \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $f \in H^{k+1}$ and $g \in H^k$ $(k \ge 0)$. Then the above problem has a solution $(\sigma, u) \in H^{k+1} \times H^{k+2} \cap H^1_0$ which is unique modulo a constant of integration for σ. Moreover, this solution satisfies

$$\|u\|^2_{H^{k+2}} + \|D\sigma\|^2_{H^k} \lesssim \|f\|^2_{H^{k+1}} + \|g\|^2_{H^k}.$$

Now, taking $\chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi}$ $(k=1,2)$ to the Stokes problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\mu\Delta u + a\nabla(\bar{e}\varrho+\bar{\rho}\theta) = N^u - \bar{\rho}u_t - g\varrho e_3 + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u, \\ (\bar{\rho}\bar{e}+\bar{p})\mathrm{div}u = \bar{\rho}(N^\theta + u\cdot\nabla\theta) - \bar{e}\varrho\mathrm{div}u + (\bar{e}'\varrho+\bar{\rho}'\theta)u_3 - \dfrac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\varrho+\bar{\rho}\theta) - (\bar{\rho}\bar{e})'u_3, \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{cases} -\mu\Delta(\chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi}u) + a\nabla[\chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi}(\bar{e}\varrho+\bar{\rho}\theta)] = \text{less than fourth order of } u \\ \qquad\qquad + \text{less than third order of } (\varrho,\theta) + \chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi}(N^u - \bar{\rho}u_t - g\varrho e_3 + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u), \\ \mathrm{div}(\chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi}u) = \text{less than third order of } u + \chi_j D^k_{\psi,\phi}\left\{ \left[\bar{\rho}(N^\theta + u\cdot\nabla\theta)\right.\right. \\ \qquad\qquad \left.\left. -\bar{e}\varrho\,\mathrm{div}u + (\bar{e}'\varrho+\bar{\rho}'\theta)u_3 - \frac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\varrho+\bar{\rho}\theta) - (\bar{\rho}\bar{e})'u_3\right](\bar{\rho}\bar{e}+\bar{p})^{-1}\right\}, \\ \chi_j D_{\psi,\phi}u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases}$$

Applying Lemma 3.7 to the above problem, we obtain

Lemma 3.8. *For $0 \le l+k \le 2$, we have*

$$\|\chi_j D^{2+l} D^k_{\psi,\phi}u\|^2_{L^2} + \|\chi_j D^{1+l} D^k_{\psi,\phi}(\bar{e}\rho+\bar{\rho}\theta)\|^2_{L^2} \lesssim \left\| \chi_j D^{1+l} D^k_{\psi,\phi} \frac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho+\bar{\rho}\theta) \right\|^2_{L^2} + \mathcal{R}(t).$$

Now, we are able to establish the desired energy estimate. Putting Lemmas 3.5–3.8 together, we conclude that

$$\sum_{k=0}^3 \int_0^t \left\{ \|\chi_j D^{k+1}u\|^2_{L^2} + \left\| \chi_j D^k \left[\frac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho+\bar{\rho}\theta) \right] \right\|^2_{L^2} \right\} \mathrm{d}\tau \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t \mathcal{R}\mathrm{d}\tau,$$

which, together with Lemma 3.4, yields that

$$\int_0^t \left\{ \|u\|_{H^4}^2 + \left\| \frac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) \right\|_{H^3}^2 \right\} \mathrm{d}\tau \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t \mathcal{R} \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Noting that, by Lemma 3.3, the interpolation inequality (for $j = 4$) and Young's inequality, one has

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{R} \mathrm{d}\tau \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t [\|(\varrho, \theta)\|_{H^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}(\|u\|_{H^3} + \mathcal{E}^2)] \mathrm{d}\tau,$$

whence

$$\int_0^t \left\{ \|u\|_{H^4}^2 + \left\| \frac{d}{dt}(\bar{e}\rho + \bar{\rho}\theta) \right\|_{H^3}^2 \right\} \mathrm{d}\tau \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t \left[\|(\varrho, \theta)\|_{H^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}(\|u\|_{H^3} + \mathcal{E}^2) \right] \mathrm{d}\tau. \tag{3.16}$$

On the other hand, by Lemmas 3.1–3.2, and (3.8) in Lemma 3.3, we find that

$$\mathcal{E}^2(t) + \|(\varrho, \theta)_t\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u_t(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t [\|u\|_{H^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}(\|u\|_{H^4} + \mathcal{E}^2)] \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Consequently, in view of the above inequality and (3.16), and the interpolation inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{E}^2(t) + \|(\varrho, \theta)_t\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u_t(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t \left[C_\epsilon \|(\varrho, u, \theta)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}^2(\epsilon + C_\epsilon \mathcal{E}) \right] \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where the constant C_ϵ depends on ϵ and some physical parameters in (1.4). In particular, we shall take $\epsilon = \Lambda$ later on.

Now, let us recall that the local existence and uniqueness of solutions to the perturbed equations (1.4) have been established in [21, Remark 6.1] for $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{e}$ being constants, while the global existence and uniqueness of small solutions to the perturbed equations (1.4) with heat conductivity have been shown in [26] for $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{e})$ being close to a constant state. By a slight modification in the proof of the local existence in [21, 26], one can easily obtain the existence and uniqueness of a local solution $(\rho, v, \theta) \in C^0([0, T], H^3)$ to the perturbed problem (1.4)–(1.6) for some $T > 0$. Moreover, this local solution satisfies the above *a priori* estimate (3.17). Therefore, we arrive at the following conclusion:

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{e})$ satisfies (1.2)–(1.3). For any given initial data $(\varrho_0, u_0, \theta_0) \in H^3$ satisfying the compatibility condition and*

$$\inf_{x \in \Omega} \{\varrho_0 + \bar{\rho},\ \bar{\theta}_0 + \bar{e}\} > 0,$$

then there exist a $T > 0$ and a unique solution $(\varrho, u, \theta) \in C^0([0, T], H^3)$ to the perturbed problem (1.4)–(1.6) satisfying

$$\inf_{(0,T) \times \Omega} \{\varrho + \bar{\rho}, \theta + \bar{e}\} > 0.$$

Moreover, there is a sufficiently small constant $\delta_1^0 \in (0, 1]$, such that if $\mathcal{E}(t) \le \delta_1^0$ on $[0, T]$, then the solution (ϱ, u, θ) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{E}^2(t) + \|(\varrho, \theta)_t(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u_t(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\le C\mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t (C\|(\varrho, u, \theta)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \Lambda \mathcal{E}^2(\tau)) \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where the constant C only depends on δ_1^0, Λ, Ω and the known physical parameters in (1.4).

4. Nonlinear instability

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.1 by adopting and modifying the ideas in [9, 16, 17]. In view of Theorem 2.1, we can construct a (linear) solution

$$\left(\varrho^{\mathrm{l}}, u^{\mathrm{l}}, \theta^{\mathrm{l}}\right) = e^{\Lambda t}\left(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0\right) \tag{4.1}$$

to the linearized problem (1.5)–(1.7) with the initial data $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0) \in H^3$. Furthermore, this solution satisfies

$$\|(\bar{u}_{01}, \bar{u}_{02})\|_{L^2}\|\bar{u}_{03}\|_{L^2} > 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\bar{u}_{0i}$ stands for the i-th component of $\bar{u}_0$ for $i = 1$, 2 and 3. In what follows, $C_1, \cdots, C_7$ will denote generic constants that may depend on $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)$, δ_1^0, Λ, Ω and the known physical parameters in (1.4), but are independent of δ.

Obvious, we can not directly use the initial data of the linearized equations (1.5)–(1.7) as the one of the associated nonlinear problem, since the linearized and nonlinear equations enjoy different compatibility conditions at the boundary. A similar problem also arises in [16], where Jang and Tice studied the instability of the spherically symmetric Navier-Stokes-Poisson equations. To get around this obstacle, Jang and Tice used the implicit function theorem to produce a curve of initial data that satisfy the compatibility conditions and are close to the linear growing modes. Since our problem involves higher-dimension, we instead use the elliptic theory to construct initial data of the nonlinear equations problem which are close to the linear growing modes.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)$ be the same as in* (4.1). *Then there exists a $\delta_2^0 \in (0, 1)$ depending on $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)$, such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_2^0)$, there is a u_{r} which may depend on δ and enjoys the following properties:*

(1) The modified initial data

$$(\varrho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta, \theta_0^\delta) = \delta(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0) + \delta^2(\bar{\varrho}_0, u_{\mathrm{r}}, \bar{\theta}_0) \tag{4.3}$$

satisfy $u_0^\delta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ and the compatibility condition:

$$\left\{(\varrho_0^\delta + \bar{\rho})u_0^\delta \cdot \nabla u_0^\delta + a\nabla[(\varrho_0^\delta + \bar{\rho})(\theta_0^\delta + \bar{e}) - \bar{\rho}\bar{e}] - \mu\Delta u_0^\delta - \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u_0^\delta + g\varrho_0^\delta e_3\right\}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

(2) $(\varrho_{\mathrm{r}}, u_{\mathrm{r}}, \theta_{\mathrm{r}})$ satisfies the following estimate:

$$\|u_{\mathrm{r}}\|_{H^3} \le C_1,$$

where the constant C_1 depends on $\|(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)\|_{H^3}$ and other physical parameters, but is independent of δ.

Proof. Notice that $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)$ satisfies

$$\bar{u}_0|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad [a\nabla(\bar{e}\bar{\varrho}_0 + \bar{\rho}\bar{\theta}_0) - \mu\Delta\bar{u}_0 - \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}\bar{u}_0 + g\bar{\varrho}_0 e_3]|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Hence, if the modified initial data satisfy (4.3), then we expect u_{r} to satisfy the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} \mu\Delta u_{\mathrm{r}} + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u_{\mathrm{r}} - \delta^2\varrho_0^{**}u_{\mathrm{r}} \cdot \nabla u_{\mathrm{r}} - \delta\varrho_0^{**}(\bar{u}_0 \cdot \nabla u_{\mathrm{r}} + u_{\mathrm{r}} \cdot \nabla\bar{u}_0) \\ \quad = a\nabla(\bar{e}\bar{\varrho}_0 + \bar{\rho}\bar{\theta}_0) + g\bar{\varrho}_0 e_3 + \varrho_0^{**}\bar{u}_0 \cdot \nabla\bar{u}_0 - a\nabla(\varrho_0^*\theta_0^*) := F(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0), \\ u_{\mathrm{r}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

where $\varrho_0^* := (1+\delta)\bar{\varrho}_0$, $\theta_0^* = (1+\delta)\bar{\theta}_0$ and $\varrho_0^{**} := (\varrho_0^\delta + \bar{\rho}) = (\delta+\delta^2)\bar{\varrho}_0 + \bar{\rho}$. Thus the modified initial data naturally satisfy the compatibility condition.

Next we shall look for a solution $u_{\rm r}$ to the boundary problem (4.4) when δ is sufficiently small. We begin with the linearization of (4.4) which reads as

$$\mu\Delta u_{\rm r} + \mu_0\nabla{\rm div}u_{\rm r} = F(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0) + \delta^2\varrho_0^{**}v\cdot\nabla v + \delta\varrho_0^{**}(\bar{u}_0\cdot\nabla v + v\cdot\nabla\bar{u}_0) \tag{4.5}$$

with boundary condition

$$u_{\rm r}|_\Omega = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Let $v \in H^3$, then it follows from the elliptic theory that there is a solution $u_{\rm r}$ of (4.5)–(4.6) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\rm r}\|_{H^3} \le& \|F(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0) + \delta^2\varrho_0^{**}v\cdot\nabla v + \delta\varrho_0^{**}(\bar{u}_0\cdot\nabla v + v\cdot\nabla\bar{u}_0)\|_{H^1}\\ \le& C_{\rm m}(1 + \|(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \delta^2\|v\|_{H^2}^2).\end{aligned}$$

Now, we take $C_1 = C_{\rm m}(2 + \|(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)\|_{H^2}^2)$ and $\delta \le \min\{C_1^{-1}, 1\}$. Then for any $\|v\|_{H^3}^2 \le C_1$, one has

$$\|u_{\rm r}\|_{H^3} \le C_1.$$

Therefore we can construct an approximate function sequence $u_{\rm r}^n$, such that

$$\mu\Delta u_{\rm r}^{n+1} + \mu_0\nabla{\rm div}u_{\rm r}^{n+1} - \delta^2\varrho_0^{**}u_{\rm r}^n\cdot\nabla u_{\rm r}^n - \delta\varrho_0^{**}(\bar{u}_0\cdot\nabla u_{\rm r}^n + u_{\rm r}^n\cdot\nabla\bar{u}_0) = F(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0),$$

and for any n,

$$\|u_{\rm r}^n\|_{H^3} \le C_1, \quad \|u_{\rm r}^{n+1} - u_{\rm r}^n\|_{H^3} \le C_2\delta\|u_{\rm r}^n - u_{\rm r}^{n-1}\|_{H^3}$$

for some constant C_2 independent of δ and n. Finally, we choose a δ sufficiently small so that $C_2\delta < 1$, and then use a compactness argument to get a limit function which solves the nonlinear boundary problem (4.4). Moreover $\|u_{\rm r}\|_{H^3} \le C_1$. Thus we have proved Lemma 4.1. □

Let $(\varrho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta, \theta_0^\delta)$ be constructed as in Lemma 4.1. Then there is a constant

$$C_3 \ge \max\{1, \|\left(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0\right)\|_{L^2}\}$$

depending on $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{u}_0, \bar{\theta}_0)$, such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_2^0) \subset (0,1)$,

$$\mathcal{E}(\varrho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta, \theta_0^\delta) \le C_3\delta,$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is defined by (3.1). Recalling $\inf_{x\in\Omega}\{\bar{\rho}, \bar{e}\} > 0$ and the embedding theorem $H^2 \hookrightarrow L^\infty$, we can choose a sufficiently small δ, such that

$$\inf_{x\in\Omega}\{\varrho_0^\delta + \bar{\rho}, \theta_0^\delta + \bar{e}\} > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Hence, by virtue of Proposition 3.1, there is a $\delta_3^0 \in (0, \delta_2^0)$, such that for any $\delta < \delta_3^0$, there exists a unique local solution $(\varrho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta) \in C([0,T], H^3)$ to (1.4) and (1.6), emanating from the initial data $(\varrho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta, \theta_0^\delta)$. Moreover, (4.7) holds for any δ satisfying $\mathcal{E}(\varrho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta, \theta_0^\delta) \le C_3\delta_3^0$. Let $C > 0$ and $\delta_1^0 > 0$ be the same constants as in Proposition 3.1 and $\delta_0 = \min\{\delta_3^0, \delta_1^0/C_3\}$. Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ and

$$T^\delta = \frac{1}{\Lambda}\ln\frac{2\varepsilon_0}{\delta} > 0, \quad \text{i.e., } \delta e^{\Lambda T^\delta} = 2\varepsilon_0, \tag{4.8}$$

where $\varepsilon_0 \le 1$, independent of δ, is sufficiently small and will be fixed later. In what follows, we denote $\mathcal{E}_\delta(t) := \mathcal{E}(\varrho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta)(t)$.

Define

$$T^* = \sup\{t \in (0, T^{\max}) \mid \mathcal{E}_\delta(t) \le C_3\delta_0\}$$

and

$$T^{**} = \sup\left\{t \in (0, T^{\max}) \mid \left\|\left(\varrho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta\right)(t)\right\|_{L^2} \le 2\delta C_3 e^{\Lambda t}\right\},$$

where $T^{\max}$ denotes the maximal time of existence of the solution $(\varrho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta)$. Obviously, $T^*T^{**} > 0$, and furthermore,

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta(T^*) = C_3\delta_0 \quad \text{if } T^* < \infty, \tag{4.9}$$

$$\left\|\left(\varrho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta\right)(T^{**})\right\|_{L^2} = 2\delta C_3 e^{\Lambda T^{**}} \quad \text{if } T^{**} < T^{\max}. \tag{4.10}$$

Then for all $t \le \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$, we deduce from the estimate (3.18) and the definition of T^* and T^{**} that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_\delta^2(t) + \|(\varrho^\delta, \theta^\delta)_t(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u_t^\delta(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}^\delta\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\le C[\mathcal{E}^2(\varrho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta, \theta_0^\delta) + 2C_3^2\delta^2 e^{2\Lambda t}/\Lambda] + \Lambda\int_0^t \mathcal{E}_\delta^2(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\le C_4\delta^2 e^{2\Lambda t} + \Lambda\int_0^t \mathcal{E}_\delta^2(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_4 > 0$. Thus, applying Gronwall's inequality, one concludes

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta^2(t) + \|(\varrho^\delta, \theta^\delta)_t(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u_t^\delta(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}^\delta\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \le C_5\delta^2 e^{2\Lambda t} \tag{4.11}$$

for some constant $C_5 > 0$.

Let $(\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}, u^{\mathrm{d}}, \theta^{\mathrm{d}}) = (\varrho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta) - \delta(\varrho^{\mathrm{l}}, u^{\mathrm{l}}, \theta^{\mathrm{l}})$. Noting that $(\varrho_\delta^{\mathrm{a}}, u_\delta^{\mathrm{a}}, \theta_\delta^{\mathrm{a}}) := \delta(\varrho^{\mathrm{l}}, u^{\mathrm{l}}, \theta^{\mathrm{l}})$ is also a solution to the linearized problem (1.5)–(1.7) with the initial data $\delta(\bar\varrho_0, \bar u_0, \bar\theta_0) \in H^3$, we find that $(\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}, u^{\mathrm{d}}, \theta^{\mathrm{d}})$ satisfies the following non-homogenous equations:

$$\begin{cases}
\varrho_t^{\mathrm{d}} + \mathrm{div}(\bar\rho u^{\mathrm{d}}) = -\mathrm{div}(\varrho^\delta u^\delta) := N^\varrho(\rho^\delta, u^\delta) := N_\delta^\varrho, \\
\bar\rho u_t^{\mathrm{d}} + a\nabla(\bar e\varrho^{\mathrm{d}} + \bar\rho\theta^{\mathrm{d}}) - \mu\nabla\mathrm{div}u^{\mathrm{d}} - \mu_0\Delta u^{\mathrm{d}} + g\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}e_3 \\
\qquad = -(\varrho^\delta + \bar\rho)u^\delta\cdot\nabla u^\delta - \varrho^\delta u_t^\delta - a\nabla(\varrho^\delta\theta^\delta) := N^u(\rho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta) := N_\delta^u, \\
\theta_t^{\mathrm{d}} + \bar e' u_3^{\mathrm{d}} + a\bar e\mathrm{div}u^{\mathrm{d}} = [\mu|\nabla u^\delta + \nabla(u^\delta)^{\mathrm{T}}|^2/2 + \lambda(\mathrm{div}u^\delta)^2]/(\varrho^\delta + \bar\rho) \\
\qquad\qquad -u^\delta\cdot\nabla\theta^\delta - a\theta^\delta\mathrm{div}u^\delta := N^e(\rho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta) := N_\delta^\theta,
\end{cases} \tag{4.12}$$

with initial data $(\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}(0), u^{\mathrm{d}}(0), \theta^{\mathrm{d}}(0)) = \delta^2(\bar\varrho_0, u_{\mathrm{r}}, \bar\theta_0)$ and boundary condition $u^{\mathrm{d}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$.

Next, we shall establish the error estimate for $(\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}, u^{\mathrm{d}}, \theta^{\mathrm{d}})$ in L^2-norm.

Lemma 4.2. *There is a constant C_6, such that for all $t \le \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$,*

$$\|(\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}, u^{\mathrm{d}}, \theta^{\mathrm{d}})(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \le C_6\delta^3\theta^{3\Lambda t}. \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. We differentiate the linearized momentum equations $(4.12)_2$ in time, multiply the resulting equations by u_t in $L^2(\Omega)$, and use the equations $(4.12)_1$ and $(4.12)_3$ to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int\left\{\bar\rho|u_t^{\mathrm{d}}|^2 - g\bar\varrho'(u_3^{\mathrm{d}})^2 + [(1+a)\bar p\mathrm{div}u^{\mathrm{d}} - 2g\bar\rho u_3^{\mathrm{d}}]\mathrm{div}u^{\mathrm{d}}\right\}\mathrm{d}x \\
&= -2\mu\int|\nabla u_t^{\mathrm{d}}|^2\mathrm{d}x - 2\mu_0\int|\mathrm{div}u_t^{\mathrm{d}}|^2\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + 2\int[\partial_t N_\delta^u - gN_\delta^\varrho e_3 - a\nabla(\bar e N_\delta^\varrho + \bar\rho N_\delta^\theta)]\cdot u_t^{\mathrm{d}}\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Thanks to (2.22), one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\{g\bar{\rho}'(u_3^{\rm d})^2+[2g\bar{\rho}u_3^{\rm d}-(1+a)\bar{p}{\rm div}u^{\rm d}]{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\}{\rm d}x\\&\quad\le\Lambda\int\left(\mu|\nabla u^{\rm d}|^2+\mu_0|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}|^2\right){\rm d}x+\Lambda^2\int\bar{\rho}|u^{\rm d}|^2{\rm d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, integrating (4.14) in time from 0 to t, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}u_t^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+2\int_0^t(\mu\|\nabla u_\tau^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u_\tau^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2){\rm d}\tau\\&\le I_1^0+\Lambda^2\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}+\Lambda\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\Lambda\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\&\quad+2\int_0^t\int[\partial_\tau N_\delta^u-gN_\delta^\varrho e_3-a\nabla(\bar{e}N_\delta^\varrho+\bar{\rho}N_\delta^\theta)]\cdot u_\tau^{\rm d}{\rm d}x{\rm d}\tau,\end{aligned}\tag{4.15}$$

where

$$I_1^0=\left\{\int\left\{\bar{\rho}|u_t^{\rm d}|^2-g\bar{\rho}'(u_3^{\rm d})^2+[(1+a)\bar{p}{\rm div}u^{\rm d}-2g\bar{\rho}u_3^{\rm d}]{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\right\}{\rm d}x\right\}\Big|_{t=0}.$$

Using Newton-Leibniz's formula and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Lambda(\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2)\\&=I_2^0+2\Lambda\int_0^t\int_\Omega\left(\mu\sum_{1\le i,j\le3}\partial_{x_i}u_{j\tau}^{\rm d}\partial_{x_i}u_{j\tau}^{\rm d}{\rm d}x{\rm d}\tau+\mu_0{\rm div}u_\tau^{\rm d}{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\right){\rm d}x{\rm d}\tau\\&\le I_2^0+\int_0^t(\mu\|\nabla u_\tau^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u_\tau^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2){\rm d}\tau+\Lambda^2\int_0^t(\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2){\rm d}\tau,\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

where $I_2^0=\Lambda(\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}(0)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}(0)\|_{L^2}^2)$ and $u_{j\tau}^{\rm d}$ denotes the j-th component of $u_\tau^{\rm d}$. On the other hand,

$$\Lambda\partial_t\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2=2\Lambda\int_\Omega\bar{\rho}u^{\rm d}(t)\cdot u_t^{\rm d}(t){\rm d}x\le\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}u_t^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\Lambda^2\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2.\tag{4.17}$$

Hence, putting (4.15)–(4.17) together, we obtain the differential inequality

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le2\Lambda\left[\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^t(\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2){\rm d}s\right]\\&\quad+\frac{I_1^0+2I_2^0}{\Lambda}+\frac{2}{\Lambda}\int_0^t\int[\partial_\tau N_\delta^u-gN_\delta^\varrho e_3-a\nabla(\bar{e}N_\delta^\varrho+\bar{\rho}N_\delta^\theta)]\cdot u_\tau^{\rm d}{\rm d}x{\rm d}\tau.\end{aligned}\tag{4.18}$$

Next, we control the last two terms on the right hand of (4.18). Noting that

$$\delta e^{\Lambda t}\le2\varepsilon_0\le2\quad\text{for any }t\le\min\{T^\delta,T^*,T^{**}\},\tag{4.19}$$

we utilize (4.11) and (4.1), Höldear's inequality and Sobolev's embedding theorem to infer that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|2\int_0^t\int[\partial_\tau N_\delta^u-gN_\delta^\varrho e_3-a\nabla(\bar{e}N_\delta^\varrho+\bar{\rho}N_\delta^\theta)]\cdot u_\tau^{\rm d}{\rm d}x{\rm d}\tau\right|\\&\lesssim\int_0^t(\|(N_\delta^\varrho,N_\delta^\theta)\|_{H^1}+\|\partial_\tau N_\delta^u\|_{L^2})(\|u_\tau^{\rm a}\|_{L^2}+\|u_\tau^\delta\|_{L^2}){\rm d}\tau\\&\lesssim\int_0^t(\delta^3e^{3\Lambda\tau}+\delta^2e^{2\Lambda\tau}+\delta e^{\Lambda\tau}\|u_{\tau\tau}^\delta\|_{L^2})\delta e^{\Lambda\tau}{\rm d}\tau\\&\lesssim\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t}+\delta^4e^{4\Lambda t}\lesssim\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t},\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
(I_1^0+2I_2^0)/\Lambda \lesssim & (\|\sqrt{\bar\rho}u_t^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla u_0^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\|u_3^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2)|_{t=0}\\
\lesssim & [\|(\varrho^{\rm d},\theta^{\rm d})\|_{H^1}^2+\|u^{\rm d}\|_{H^2}^2+\mathcal{E}_\delta^2(\mathcal{E}_\delta^2+\mathcal{E}_\delta^4+\|u_t^\delta\|_{L^2}^2)]|_{t=0}\\
\lesssim & \delta^4(\|(\bar\varrho_0,\bar\theta_0)\|_{H^1}^2+\|u_{\rm r}\|_{H^2}^2)+\delta^2e^{2\Lambda t}(\delta^2e^{2\Lambda t}+\delta^4e^{4\Lambda t})\lesssim\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.21}
$$

Thus, substituting (4.21) and (4.20) into (4.18), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\|\sqrt{\bar\rho}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\le 2\Lambda\left[\|\sqrt{\bar\rho}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^t(\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2){\rm d}\tau\right]+C_7\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality to the above inequality, one obtains

$$
\|\sqrt{\bar\rho}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^t(\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2){\rm d}\tau\lesssim\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t}+\delta^4\|\sqrt{\bar\rho}u_{\rm r}\|_{L^2}^2\lesssim\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t}
\tag{4.22}
$$

for all $t\le\min\{T^\delta,T^*,T^{**}\}$. Thus, making use of (4.15), (4.16) and (4.20)–(4.22), we deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\Lambda}\|\sqrt{\bar\rho}u_t^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\le\Lambda\|\sqrt{\bar\rho}u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+2\Lambda\int_0^t(\mu\|\nabla u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2+\mu_0\|{\rm div}u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2){\rm d}\tau\\
&\quad+\frac{I_1^0+2I_2^0}{\Lambda}+\frac{2}{\Lambda}\int_0^t\int[\partial_\tau N_\delta^u-gN_\delta^\varrho e_3-a\nabla(\bar eN_\delta^\varrho+\bar\rho N_\delta^\theta)]\cdot u_\tau^{\rm d}{\rm d}x{\rm d}\tau\lesssim\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.23}
$$

which, together with Poincaré's inequality and the estimates (4.22), yields

$$
\|u^{\rm d}(t)\|_{H^1}^2+\|u_t^{\rm d}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^t\|\nabla u^{\rm d}\|_{L^2}^2{\rm d}\tau\lesssim\delta^3e^{3\Lambda t}.
\tag{4.24}
$$

Finally, using the equations $(4.12)_1$ and $(4.12)_2$, and the estimates (4.19) and (4.24), we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|(\varrho^{\rm d},\theta^{\rm d})(t)\|_{L^2}\le&\delta^2\|(\varrho_{\rm r},\theta_{\rm r})\|_{L^2}+\int_0^t\|(\varrho^{\rm d},\theta^{\rm d})_\tau\|_{L^2}{\rm d}\tau\\
\lesssim&\delta^2+\int_0^t(\|u\|_{H^1}+\|(N_\delta^\varrho,N_\delta^\theta)\|_{L^2}){\rm d}\tau\\
\lesssim&\delta^2+\int_0^t(\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}e^{\frac{3\Lambda}{2}\tau}+\mathcal{E}_\delta^2(\tau)){\rm d}\tau\lesssim\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}e^{\frac{3\Lambda}{2}t}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Putting the previous estimates together, we get (4.13) immediately. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

Now, we claim that

$$
T^\delta=\min\left\{T^\delta,T^*,T^{**}\right\},
\tag{4.25}
$$

provided that small ε_0 is taken to be

$$
\varepsilon_0=\min\left\{\frac{C_3\delta_0}{4\sqrt{C_5}},\frac{C_3^2}{8C_6},\frac{m_0^2}{C_6},1\right\}>0,
\tag{4.26}
$$

where $m_0 = \min\{\|(\bar{u}_{01}, \bar{u}_{02})\|_{L^2}, \|\bar{u}_{03}\|_{L^2}\} > 0$ due to (4.2).

Indeed, if $T^* = \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$, then $T^* < \infty$. Moreover, from (4.11) and (4.8) we get

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta(T^*) \le \sqrt{C_5}\delta e^{\Lambda T^*} \le \sqrt{C_5}\delta e^{\Lambda T^\delta} = 2\sqrt{C_5}\varepsilon_0 < C_3\delta_0,$$

which contradicts with (4.9). On the other hand, if $T^{**} = \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$, then $T^{**} < T^{\max}$. Moreover, in view of (4.1), (4.8) and (4.13), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left(\varrho^\delta, u^\delta, \theta^\delta\right)(T^{**})\right\|_{L^2} \le& \|(\varrho_\delta^{\mathrm{a}}, u_\delta^{\mathrm{a}}, \theta_\delta^{\mathrm{a}})(T^{**})\|_{L^2} + \left\|\left(\varrho^{\mathrm{d}}, u^{\mathrm{d}}, \theta_\delta^{\mathrm{d}}\right)(T^{**})\right\|_{L^2} \\
\le& \delta\left\|\left(\varrho^{\mathrm{l}}, u^{\mathrm{l}}, \theta^{\mathrm{l}}\right)(T^{**})\right\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{C_6}\delta^{3/2}e^{3\Lambda T^{**}/2} \\
\le& \delta C_3 e^{\Lambda T^{**}} + \sqrt{C_6}\delta^{3/2}e^{3\Lambda T^{**}/2} \\
\le& \delta e^{\Lambda T^{**}}(C_3 + \sqrt{2C_6\varepsilon_0}) < 2\delta C_3 e^{\Lambda T^{**}},
\end{aligned}$$

which also contradicts with (4.10). Therefore, (4.25) holds.

Finally, we again use (4.26) and (4.13) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_3^\delta(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} \ge& \|u_{3\delta}^{\mathrm{a}}(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} - \|u_3^{\mathrm{d}}(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} = \delta e^{\Lambda T^\delta}\|\bar{u}_{03}\|_{L^2} - \|u_3^{\mathrm{d}}(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} \\
\ge& \delta e^{\Lambda T^\delta}\|\bar{u}_{03}\|_{L^2} - \sqrt{C_6}\delta^{3/2}e^{3\Lambda^* T^\delta/2} \ge 2m_0\varepsilon_0 - \sqrt{C_6}\varepsilon_0^{3/2} \ge m_0\varepsilon_0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $u_3^\delta(T^\delta)$ denote the third component of $u^\delta(T^\delta)$. Similar, we also have

$$\|(u_1^\delta, u_2^\delta)(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} \ge m_0\varepsilon_0.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1 by defining $\varepsilon = m_0\varepsilon_0$. In addition, if $\bar{\rho}' \ge 0$, then the function $\bar{\rho}_0$ constructed in (4.1) satisfies $\|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^2} > 0$. Thus we also obtain $\|\varrho^\delta(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} \ge m_0\varepsilon_0$, if we define $m_0 = \min\{\|\bar{\varrho}_0\|_{L^2}, \|(\bar{u}_{01}, \bar{u}_{02})\|_{L^2}, \|\bar{u}_{03}\|_{L^2}\} > 0$. Hence, the assertion in Remark 1.1 holds.

Appendix

In this section we show that Λ defined by (2.22) is the sharp growth rate for any solutions to the linearized problem (1.5)–(1.7). Since the density varies for a compressible fluid, the spectrums of the linearized solution operator are difficult to analyze in comparison with an incompressible fluid, and it is hard to obtain the largest growth rate of the solution operator in some Sobolev space in the usual way. Here we exploit energy estimates as in [17] to show that $e^{\Lambda t}$ is indeed the sharp growth rate for (ϱ, u, θ) in H^2-norm.

Proposition Appendix .1. *Assume that the assumption of Theorem 2.1 is satisfied. Let (ϱ, u, θ) solve the following linearized problem:*

$$\begin{cases}
\varrho_t + \mathrm{div}(\bar{\rho}u) = 0, \\
\bar{\rho}u_t + a\nabla(\bar{e}\varrho + \bar{\rho}\theta) = \mu\Delta u + \mu_0\nabla\mathrm{div}u - g\varrho e_3, \\
\theta_t + v\cdot\nabla\bar{e} + a\bar{e}\mathrm{div}v = 0
\end{cases} \tag{A.1}$$

with initial and boundary conditions $(\varrho, u, \theta)|_{t=0} = (\varrho_0, u_0, \theta_0)$ in Ω and $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ for $t > 0$. Then, we have the following estimates.

$$\|(\varrho, \theta)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}s \le Ce^{2\Lambda t}(\|(\varrho_0, \theta_0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2), \tag{A.2}$$

$$\|(\varrho, u, \theta)(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \int_0^t \left[\|u\|_{H^3}^2 + \|(\bar{e}\rho_t + \bar{\rho}\theta_t)\|_{H^2}^2\right]\mathrm{d}\tau \le Ce^{2\Lambda t}\|(\varrho_0, u_0, \theta_0)\|_{H^2}^2 \tag{A.3}$$

for any $t \geq 0$, where Λ is constructed by (2.21), and the constant C may depend on g, μ, μ_0, $\bar{e}$, $\bar{\rho}$, Λ and Ω.

Proof. The first estimate (A.2) can be shown by an argument similar to that in Lemma 4.2. In fact, following the process in the derivation of (4.18) and (4.23), we obtain the following two inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}} u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu_0 \|\mathrm{div} u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq I_1 + 2\Lambda \left[\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t (\mu \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu_0 \|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2}^2) \mathrm{d}\tau \right] \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\Lambda} \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}} u_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu_0 \|\mathrm{div} u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq I_1 + \Lambda \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}} u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\Lambda \int_0^t (\mu \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu_0 \|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2}^2) \mathrm{d}\tau \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

with

$$I_1 = \left\{ 2(\mu \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu_0 \|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{1}{\Lambda} \int \left\{ \bar{\rho} |u_t|^2 - g \bar{\rho}' u_3^2 + [(1+a)\bar{p} \mathrm{div} u - 2g\bar{\rho} u_3] \mathrm{div} u \right\} \mathrm{d}x \right\} \Big|_{t=0}.$$

An application of Gronwall's inequality to (A.4) implies that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}} u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t (\mu \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu_0 \|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2}^2) \mathrm{d}\tau \leq & e^{2\Lambda t} \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}} u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{I_1}{2\Lambda} \left(e^{2\Lambda t} - 1 \right) \\ \leq & C e^{2\Lambda t} (\|(\varrho_0, \theta_0)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with Poincaré's inequality and (A.5), results in

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}s \leq C e^{2\Lambda t} (\|(\varrho_0, \theta_0)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2).$$

Thus, using $(\mathrm{A}.1)_1$ and $(\mathrm{A}.1)_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\varrho, \theta)(t)\|_{L^2} \leq & \|(\varrho_0, \theta_0)\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|(\varrho, \theta)_s(s)\|_{L^2} \mathrm{d}s \\ \leq & \|(\varrho_0, \theta_0)\|_{L^2} + (1+a) \|(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\theta})\|_{H^1} \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{H^1} \mathrm{d}s \\ \leq & C e^{\Lambda t} (\|(\varrho_0, \theta_0)\|_{H^1} + \|u_0\|_{H^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the estimate (A.2) follows from the above two estimates.

Finally, following the arguments in the proof of (3.17), one find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\varrho, u, \theta)(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \int_0^t \left[\|u\|_{H^3}^2 + \|(\bar{e}\rho_t + \bar{\rho}\theta_t)\|_{H^2}^2 \right] \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\leq C \|(\varrho_0, u_0, \theta_0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \int_0^t [C \|(\varrho, u, \theta)\|_{L^2}^2 + \Lambda \|(\varrho, u, \theta)\|_{H^2}^2] \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (A.2), gives (A.3) due to Gronwall's inequality. This completes the proof. □

Acknowledgements. The research of Fei Jiang was supported by NSFC (Grant Nos. 11101044, 11271051 and 11301083), and the research of Song Jiang by the National Basic Research Program under the Grant 2011CB309705 and NSFC (Grant Nos. 11229101, 11371065). This work was finished when Fei Jiang was visiting the City University of Hong Kong. Fei Jiang would like to thank Prof. Tong Yang for his kind hospitality.

References

[1] R.A. Adams, J. John, Sobolev Space, Academic Press: New York, 2005.

[2] I. Bouya, Instability of the forced magnetohydrodynamics system at small reynolds number , SIAM J. Math. Anal., 45 (2013) 307–323.

[3] R. Duan, F. Jiang, S. Jiang, On the Rayleigh-Taylor instability for incompressible, inviscid magnetohydrodynamic flows, SIAM J. App. Math. 71 (2012) 1990–2013.

[4] S. Friedlander, P. Nataša, V. Vicol, Nonlinear instability for the critically dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation, Commun. Math. Phys. 292 (2009) 797–810.

[5] S. Friedlander, W. Strauss, M. Vishik, Nonlinear instability in an ideal fluid, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis 14 (1997) 187–209.

[6] S. Gauthier, B. Le Creurer, Compressibility effects in rayleigh–taylor instability-induced flows, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 368 (2010) 1681–1704.

[7] D. Gérard-Varet, Oscillating solutions of incompressible magnetohydrodynamics and dynamo effect, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 37 (2005) 815–840.

[8] E. Grenier, On the nonlinear instability of Euler and Prandtl equations, Comm. Pure Appli. Math. 53 (2000) 1067–091.

[9] Y. Guo, C. Hallstrom, D. Spirn, Dynamics near unstable, interfacial fluids, Commun. Math. Phys. 270 (2007) 635–689.

[10] Y. Guo, W. Strauss, Instability of periodic BGK equilibria, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 48 (1995) 861–894.

[11] Y. Guo, I. Tice, Compressible, inviscid Rayleigh-Taylor instability, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 60 (2011) 677–712.

[12] Y. Guo, I. Tice, Linear rayleigh-taylor instability for viscous, compressible fluids, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 42 (2011) 1688–1720.

[13] Y. He, X. Hu, Z. Jiang, Compressibility effects on the Rayleigh–Taylor instability growth rates , Chin. Phys. Lett. 25 (2008) 1015.

[14] H.J. Hwang, Variational approach to nonlinear gravity-driven instability in a MHD setting, Quart. Appl. Math. 66 (2008) 303–324.

[15] H.J. Hwang, Y. Guo, On the dynamical Rayleigh-Taylor instability, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 167 (2003) 235–253.

[16] J. Jang, I. Tice, Instability theory of the Navier-Stokes-Poisson equations, To appear in Analysis & PDE (2011).

[17] F. Jiang, S. Jiang, On instability and stability of three-dimensional gravity flows in a bounded domain (Submitted) 2014.

[18] F. Jiang, S. Jiang, G.X. Ni, Nonlinear instability for nonhomogeneous incompressible viscous fluids, Sci. China Math. 56 (2013) 665–686.

[19] F. Jiang, S. Jiang, W. Wang, Nonlinear Rayleigh-Taylor instability in nonhomogeneous incompressible viscous magnetohydrodynamic fluids, sumbission (2013).

[20] F. Jiang, S. Jiang, Y. Wang, On the Rayleigh-Taylor instability for the incompressible viscous magnetohydrodynamic equations, Comm. P.D.E. 39 (2014) 399–438.

[21] S. Kawashima, Systems of a hyperbolic-parabolic composite type, with applications to the equations of magnetohydrodynamics (1984).

[22] M.A. Lafay, B. Le Creurer, S. Gauthier, Compressibility effects on the Rayleigh-Taylor instability between miscible fluids, EPL (Europhysics Letters) 79 (2007) 64002.
[23] D. Livescu, Compressibility effects on the Rayleigh-Taylor instability growth between immiscible fluids, Phys. Fluids 16 (2004), doi:10.1063/1.1630800.
[24] D. Livescu, Comment on compressible Rayleigh–Taylor instabilities in supernova remnants [Phys. Fluids 16, 4661 (2004)], Phys. of Fluids 17 (2005) 069101.
[25] A. Matsumura, T. Nishida, The initial value problem for the equation of compressible viscous and heat-conductive fluids, Proc. Jpn. Acad. Ser-A. 55 (1979) 337–342.
[26] A. Matsumura, T. Nishida, Initial-boundary value problems for the equations of motion of general fluids, computing methods in applied sciences and engineering, J. Math. Kyoto. Univ. V (Versailles, 1981) 20 (1982) 389–406.
[27] A. Matsumura, T. Nishida, Initial boundary value problems for the equations of motion of compressible viscous and heat conductive fluids, Comm. Math. Phys. 89 (1983) 445–464.
[28] A. Novotnỳ, I. Straškraba, Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of Compressible Flow, Oxford University Press, USA, 2004.
[29] J. Prüess, G. Simonett, On the Rayleigh-Taylor instability for the two-phase Navier-Stokes equations, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 59 (2010) 1853–1871.
[30] L. Rayleigh, Analytic solutions of the Rayleigh equations for linear density profiles, Proc. London. Math. Soc. 14 (1883) 170–177.
[31] M. Vishik, S. Friedlander, Nonlinear instability in two dimensional ideal fluids: the case of a dominant eigenvalue, Comm. Math. Phys. 243 (2003) 261–273.
[32] Y. Wang, I. Tice, The viscous surface-internal wave problem: nonlinear rayleigh-taylor instability, Commun. P.D.E. 37 (2012) 1967–2028.